



3 1761 11972514 1

CA1 XC 37  
-S97

Canada. Parliament. House of  
Commons. [Committees]. Standing  
committee on Standing orders  
Minutes of proceedings and  
evidence  
1966  
no. 1 - 2





HOUSE OF COMMONS

First Session—Twenty-seventh Parliament

1966

STANDING COMMITTEE

ON

**STANDING ORDERS**

*Chairman:* Mr. PATRICK T. ASSELIN

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 1

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1966

TUESDAY, JUNE 14, 1966

THURSDAY, JUNE 30, 1966

Respecting Petitions  
of

Canadian Pacific Railway Company

La Société des Artisans

Baptist General Conference of Canada

WITNESSES:

Mr. Bud Sherman, M.P.; Mr. Gregory Gorman, Parliamentary Agent;  
and Mr. Luc Parent, Q.C., Parliamentary Agent.

ROGER DUHAMEL, F.R.S.C.

QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY  
OTTAWA, 1966

STANDING COMMITTEE ON STANDING ORDERS

Chairman: Mr. Patrick T. Asselin

Vice-Chairman: Mr. James McNulty

and

Mr. Baldwin  
Mr. Bigg  
Mr. Boulanger  
Mr. Brown  
Mr. Caron  
Mr. Carter  
Mr. Churchill

Mr. Coates  
Mr. Duquet  
Mr. Éthier  
Mr. Groos  
Mr. Guay  
Mr. Gundlock  
Mr. Horner (*Jasper-  
Edson*)

Mr. Johnston  
Mr. LeBlanc (*Rimouski*)  
Mr. Loiselle  
Mr. MacDonald (*Prince*)  
Mr. Mongrain  
Mr. Thomas (*Middlesex  
West*)  
\*Mr. Winch—23.

E. W. Innes,  
Clerk of the Committee.

\*Mr. Peters replaced Mr. Winch on June 15, 1966.

## ORDERS OF REFERENCE

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

MONDAY, February 7, 1966.

*Resolved*,—That the following Members do compose the Standing Committee on Standing Orders:

## STANDING ORDERS

Messrs.

Asselin ( <i>Richmond-Wolfe</i> )	Coates	LeBlanc ( <i>Rimouski</i> )
Baldwin	Duquet	Loiselle
Bigg	Éthier	MacDonald ( <i>Prince</i> )
Boulanger	Groos	McNulty
Brown	Guay	Mongrain
Caron	Gundlock	Thomas ( <i>Middlesex West</i> )
Carter	Horner ( <i>Jasper-Edson</i> )	Winch—23.
Churchill	Johnston	

*Ordered*,—That, notwithstanding the provisions of Standing Order 65, the said Committee shall consist of twenty-three members.

WEDNESDAY, June 1, 1966.

*Ordered*,—That the petition of Canadian Pacific Railways Company, for an Act authorizing the construction of a line of railway, and the petition of La Société Des Artisans, for an Act to amend its Act of incorporation, both filed after the time limit for the introduction of Private Bills specified under Standing Order 93, be referred to the Standing Committee on Standing Orders, together with the Tenth Report and the Thirteenth Report of the Clerk of Petitions thereon presented to the House on Thursday, May 19, 1966, and Thursday, May 26, 1966, for any recommendations the Committee deems advisable.

WEDNESDAY, June 15, 1966.

*Ordered*,—That the name of Mr. Peters be substituted for that of Mr. Winch on the Standing Committee on Standing Orders.

WEDNESDAY, June 22, 1966.

*Ordered*,—That the petition of Baptist General Conference of Canada, filed after the time limit for the introduction of Private Bills specified under



Standing Order 93, be referred to the Standing Committee on Standing Orders, together with the Fifteenth Report of the Clerk of Petitions thereon presented to the House on Thursday, June 16, 1966, for any recommendations the Committee deems advisable.

Attest.

LÉON-J. RAYMOND,  
The Clerk of the House.

## REPORTS TO THE HOUSE

THURSDAY, June 16, 1966.

The Standing Committee on Standing Orders has the honour to present its

### FIRST REPORT

Pursuant to its Order of Reference of June 1, 1966 your Committee has considered the following petitions for Private Bills, filed after the time specified in Standing Order 93, together with the Clerk of Petitions' reports thereon tabled on May 19 and 26, 1966.

#### 1. *Canadian Pacific Railway Company*

Counsel for the petitioner stated that the delay of approximately two weeks, beyond the time specified for filing petitions for Private Bills under Standing Order 93 was occasioned by the negotiations which were in progress between the railway and Canadian Superior Oil Limited for the construction of the line.

The Parliamentary Agent requested that the petition be received during the present session.

#### 2. *La Société des Artisans*

The Parliamentary Agent for the petitioner stated that the General Council of the Society was not in a position to consider and approve the proposed legislative changes until after March 11, 1966, which was after the time specified under Standing Order 93, for the presentation of petitions. Counsel contended that the petition was filed as soon as the proposed changes were approved by the Superintendent of Insurance.

A request was made that the petition be received by the House of Commons during the present session of Parliament.

Having considered the petition for a Private Bill numbered above as 1, your Committee recommends that Standing Order 93 be suspended, in relation thereto, and that this petition be received. The consequent charges as provided by Standing Order 94(3) (a) and (c) will amount to \$300.00.

Having considered the petition for a Private Bill numbered above as 2, your Committee recommends that the petition be received, that in relation thereto Standing Orders 93 and 94(3)(c) be suspended, and that Standing Order 94(3)(a) be suspended only in relation to Standing Order 94(3)(c), but not in relation to Standing Order 93, thereby levying a charge of \$100.00.

The petitions referred to above, together with the reports of the Clerk of Petitions related thereto are returned herewith.

Respectfully submitted,

PATRICK T. ASSELIN,  
*Chairman.*

(Concurred in June 21)

TUESDAY, July 5, 1966.

The Standing Committee on Standing Orders has the honour to present its

#### SECOND REPORT

Pursuant to its Order of Reference of June 22, 1966, your Committee has considered the following petition for a Private Bill, filed after the time specified in Standing Order 93, together with the Clerk of Petitions' report thereon tabled on June 16, 1966.

#### BAPTIST GENERAL CONFERENCE OF CANADA

The sponsor of the petition explained that the initial steps had been taken about a year ago, to secure the necessary legislation. Since that time, certain changes in the personnel of the group concerned had necessitated some delay. He contended that, in the interests of the work of the organization, it is necessary to secure the passage of the proposed legislation as soon as possible, and requested that the petition be allowed to proceed.

Having considered this petition for a Private Bill, your Committee recommends that Standing Orders 93 and 94(3)(a) and (c) be suspended; and that the petition be received. This will result in the waiving of all charges.

The petition referred to above, together with the report of the Clerk of Petitions related thereto, is returned herewith.

A copy of the relevant Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issue No. 1*) is appended.

Respectfully submitted,

PATRICK T. ASSELIN,  
*Chairman.*

(Concurred in July 7)



## MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

THURSDAY, February 17, 1966.

(1)

The Standing Committee on Standing Orders met at 11.05 a.m. on this day for organization purposes.

*Members present:* Messrs. Asselin (*Richmond-Wolfe*), Baldwin, Carter, Churchill, Duquet, Éthier, Groos, Guay, Johnston, LeBlanc (*Rimouski*), Loiselle, MacDonald, (*Prince*), McNulty, Winch (14).

Moved by Mr. Carter, seconded by Mr. Groos that Mr. Patrick Asselin (*Richmond-Wolfe*) do take the Chair of this Committee as Chairman.

There being no other nominations, Mr. Asselin was declared duly elected Chairman.

Mr. Asselin took the Chair, thanked the members for the honour conferred on him and referred briefly to the Committee's Order of Reference.

On motion of Mr. Éthier, seconded by Mr. Loiselle, Mr. James McNulty was elected Vice-Chairman.

A suggestion was made to the effect that the Committee should decide on the number of transcripts of its proceedings that might be require in the future. This matter was deferred to a later date.

The Clerk of the Committee was questioned briefly on the matters that might be expected to come before the Committee, and respecting past practice in that regard.

On motion of Mr. Churchill, seconded by Mr. Duquet, at 11.15 a.m. the Committee adjourned to the call of the Chair.

WEDNESDAY, June 8, 1966.

The Standing Committee on Standing Orders having been duly called to meet at 1.30 o'clock p.m. this day, the following members were present: Messrs. Asselin (*Richmond-Wolfe*), Caron, Churchill, Guay, Gundlock, LeBlanc (*Rimouski*), Loiselle, McNulty, Winch (9).

*In attendance:* Messrs. Gregory Gorman, and Luc Parent, Q.C., Parliamentary Agents.

There being no quorum, at 1.50 o'clock p.m., the Chairman postponed the meeting until 1.30 o'clock p.m., Tuesday, June 14, 1966.

TUESDAY, June 14, 1966.

(2)

The Standing Committee on Standing Orders met at 1.35 p.m. this day, the Chairman, Mr. Patrick P. Asselin presiding.

*Members present:* Messrs. Asselin (*Richmond-Wolfe*), Baldwin, Bigg, Boulanger, Brown, Caron, Carter, Churchill, Éthier, Guay, LeBlanc (*Rimouski*), Loiselle, MacDonald (*Prince*), McNulty, Thomas (*Middlesex West*), Winch (16).

*In attendance:* Mr. Gregory Gorman, Ottawa and Mr. Luc Parent, Montreal both Parliamentary Agents; as well as Mr. Rosaire Gendron, M.P., the Sponsor of one of the Petitions.

The Chairman outlined briefly the duties and responsibilities of the Committee in the consideration of the Petitions which had been filed after the period specified under Standing Order 93.

Mr. Caron, as a question of privilege, protested that the notes prepared by the Canadian Pacific Railway respecting the late filing of their Petition, were not available in both official languages. We requested the Committee not to proceed with consideration of the Canadian Pacific Railway Petition until such time as these notes were submitted in French as well as in English.

Following considerable discussion and various proposals the Parliamentary Agent for the Canadian Pacific Railway undertook to supply to the French speaking members a translation of the notes that had been submitted in English.

On the suggestion of the Chairman, the various procedural proposals that had been put forth were withdrawn on the understanding that in future, persons appearing before the Committee would be advised that any notes or memoranda for information of the Committee members must be in both official languages.

*Agreed,—*That the Committee proceed to its Order of the day as follows:

1. *Petition of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company* (filed March 15, 1966.)

Mr. Gregory Gorman, Counsel for the Petitioner stated that the delay of approximately two weeks, beyond the time specified for filing petitions for Private Bills under Standing Order 93 was occasioned by the negotiations which were in progress between the railway and Canadian Superior Oil Limited for the construction of the line.

The Parliamentary Agent requested that the petition be received during the present session.

On motion of Mr. Winch, seconded by Mr. Caron,

*Resolved unanimously,—*That a recommendation be made to the House that Standing Order 93 be suspended in relation to this petition, and a petition be received with the consequent charges of \$300.00 being levied.



2. *Petition of La Société des Artisans* (filed March 15, 1966).

Mr. Luc Parent, Parliamentary Agent for the petitioner, stated that the General Council of the Society was not in a position to consider and approve the proposed legislative changes until after March 11, 1966, which was after the time specified under Standing Order 93, for the presentation of petitions. Counsel contended that the petition was filed as soon as the proposed changes were approved by the Superintendent of Insurance.

A request was made that the petition be received by the House of Commons during the present session of Parliament.

On motion of Mr. Winch, seconded by Mr. Boulanger,

*Resolved*,—That a recommendation be made to the House that the petition be received, that in relation thereto Standing Orders 93 and 94(3)(c) be suspended, and that Standing Order 94(3)(a) be suspended only in relation to Standing Order 94(3)(c), but not in relation to Standing Order 93, thereby levying a charge of \$100.00.

The Chairman was instructed to report to the House accordingly.

At 2.30 p.m. the Committee adjourned to the call of the Chair.

THURSDAY, June 30, 1966.

(3)

The Standing Committee on Standing Orders met at 1.40 p.m. this day, the Chairman Mr. Patrick T. Asselin, presiding.

*Members present*: Messrs. Asselin (*Richmond-Wolfe*), Baldwin, Brown, Caron, Churchill, Duquet, Ethier, Gundlock, LeBlanc (*Rimouski*), Loiselle, MacDonald (*Prince*), McNulty, Mongrain, Peters (14).

*In attendance*: Mr. Bud Sherman, M.P., the sponsor of the petition concerned.

On motion of Mr. Caron, seconded by Mr. MacDonald (*Prince*),

*Resolved*,—That the Committee print 750 copies in English and 300 copies in French of its Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence.

The Committee proceeded to its Order of the Day as follows:

*Petition of Baptist General Conference of Canada* (filed May 11, 1966.)

The sponsor of the petition, Mr. Sherman explained that the initial steps had been taken about a year ago, to secure the necessary legislation. Since that time, certain changes in the personnel of the group concerned had necessitated some delay. He contended that, in the interests of the work of the organization, it is necessary to secure the passage of the proposed legislation as soon as possible, and requested that the petition be allowed to proceed.

On motion of Mr. Loiselle, seconded by Mr. McNulty,

*Resolved*,—That a recommendation be made to the House that the petition be received and that Standing Order 93 and 94(3) (a) and (c) be suspended. This will have the effect of waiving all charges.

The Chairman was instructed to report to the House accordingly.

At 2.00 p.m. the Committee adjourned to the call of the Chair.

E. W. Innes,  
*Clerk of the Committee.*



## EVIDENCE

(Recorded by Electronic Apparatus)

TUESDAY, 14 June 1966.

● (1.30 p.m.)

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, I now see a quorum. As you know, we called this meeting to consider two petitions which were filed in the House of Commons after the six weeks delay period from the beginning of the session.

The first one to be considered will be the one by the CPR. As you know, the acceptance of the petition and the suspension of standing order 93 will automatically levy a charge of \$300 on each petitioner unless the committee deems otherwise. So, I would like Mr. Gregory Gorman who is the parliamentary agent for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to please step forward.

Mr. CARON: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman I object to not having a French copy. I do not think we should proceed this way. If English copies were not available I would not want to proceed on this matter and I do not think the CPR should be heard until we have the French copy.

Mr. GREGORY GORMAN (*Parliamentary Agent, Canadian Pacific Railway Company*): Mr. Chairman, I must rise and apologize for not having French copies.

Mr. CARON: It is all right to apologize but we have not a copy.

Mr. GORMAN: I must say the fault is entirely mine. It is not the fault of the CPR or of the Committees Branch. I prepared this in a hurry and it was a complete oversight on my part. That the business of Parliament should be conducted in both languages is a matter that I consider, personally, to be of considerable importance. Therefore, it is doubly regrettable to me that through this oversight I did not have a French copy.

Mr. WINCH: Mr. Chairman, I want also to raise my objection. It is unfortunate it is not in both languages but everybody knows English, including my friend Mr. Caron. Therefore why should this business be held up because my hon. friend has not a copy. To him it is a matter of principle; to me it is a matter of business and an impediment blocking this committee, so why do it?

Mr. CARON: I am not blocking. I just asked to have a French copy. We have the right to have it, indeed since Confederation, and they always have good excuses when they come. They always forget or say they were in too much of a hurry—especially the CPR which have the best lawyers in Canada. They have no reason to be late and no reason to come unprepared.

Mr. WINCH: Mr. Chairman, having said that, I would like to ask why the CPR, the large corporation it is, is bringing this matter before us, and why it is late.

Mr. GORMAN: Do you wish the reason it is late, sir?

Mr. WINCH: Yes.

Mr. BOULANGER: Do I have to stand up?

The CHAIRMAN: No, not at all. Before you—

Mr. BOULANGER: My point of order is this.

The CHAIRMAN: Before you put your point of order may I suggest that we have simultaneous translation and I would ask everybody to please put on their earphones. Do we have simultaneous translation?

Mr. BOULANGER: If you had followed what I was going to say, we are now going to get it. My point of order was taken but it is no longer relevant.

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to say here on Mr. Caron's point of order that this is a regrettable circumstance that has happened.

Mr. CARON: I will not accept regrettable circumstances; I just want the petition in both languages. I do not think we should proceed with this until we have copies in both languages.

The CHAIRMAN: Well, I—

Mr. CARON: Not any more than we have the right to proceed in the House under similar circumstances.

Mr. WINCH: Mr. Chairman, may I point out to you that he is now speaking in English, and perfect English.

Mr. CARON: Perfectly, but it is a question of principle. We have been fighting since Confederation and even before on this very thing.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Caron, I am sorry but I will have to intervene here. I think that your remarks have been well accepted. Mr. Gorman has apologized and I am willing to accept his apology.

Mr. CARON: Well, I do not and I am going to withdraw because I do not think they have the right to do so, especially the CPR.

The CHAIRMAN: I am going to ask Mr. Gorman if he would like to proceed with his explanation.

*(Translation)*

Mr. BOULANGER: On a question of privilege, Mr. Chairman, one should remember that what Mr. Caron is trying to say goes much further. When we toured Western Canada with regard to the investigation, concerning the CPR, the discontinuance of "The Dominion" service, by courtesy—and it was appreciated especially in my case—there was a special motion to enable me when they were reading these grievances, to stop the speaker and to ask for an explanation. There had been no word in French and I had made the remark at that time. Fortunately, I said, "We do not have Grégoires and Caouettes with us because this would be broadcast all over the country". The CPR knows all this because it was one of the first grievances which we presented and I accepted it like a gentleman. Honestly, I have difficulty, contrary to what Mr. Winch was saying, I really have difficulty in translating especially when I am reading English. When I hear interpretation my problem is settled, but there are many



instances where I could find say, in two lines, one or two words, which I cannot understand at all if I am not given interpretation. That privilege was given to me throughout the Western tour and yet today we are being faced with the same unfortunate situation. I have no intention of holding up the work of the committee, but I would like—

(English)

Mr. WINCH: We have simultaneous translation.

Mr. BOULANGER: Now, yes but what I am trying to say is that it was otherwise.

Mr. MACDONALD (*Prince*): Mr. Chairman, in light of the fact there is this difficulty and perhaps some of us who are mostly unilingual do not fully realize the difficulty or what the difficulty would be if we had this copy before us in French. Would it be possible prior to the discussion to have the substance of the bill read by the interpreters so that those who find some difficulty reading it in English at least will have the general substance of it as it would be in translation.

The CHAIRMAN: I think this would be very good.

Mr. CARON: I do not think we have the right to sit on this until we have the two copies. I do not think we have the right; if it was in the House we would not have the right, if we objected.

Mr. WINCH: We have the right to sit on anything.

Mr. CARON: No, not if it is not right. We have not the right to, and I deny you the right to do so. And I will bring it before the House if you sit. I do not accept the fact that you can sit when we have not the two copies.

The CHAIRMAN: Order please. May I have a little order. First of all I would like to point out we are on a point of order brought up by Mr. Caron. This is a very important matter and I would suggest we have a little order so that we can understand what everybody is saying. Now, Mr. Churchill, have you a comment.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Mr. Chairman, now Mr. Caron's point of order might be very well considered if the subject matter under discussion was intricate and involved. This happens to be a very simple matter, the proposal to build a branch line out in Alberta and permission is being asked for that purpose. Now, I would suggest that the interests of western Canada might very well be taken it is not difficult with our translation system for anyone to understand that and into consideration on a matter of this sort, without us getting involved in a technicality just because there is not a document in front of us which is expressed in the French language. Now, I think that those people who have very properly raised their objection might be content with having raised that objection and get on with the business. Why must western Canada be denied consideration. We lost last week; we attempted to hold a meeting here and we had to adjourn because there was not a quorum. Now we have a quorum; why cannot we get on with it without technical objection being raised on a matter which is simple and not involved. I speak on behalf of western Canada. We want this development; let us get on with it.

Mr. CARON: How would you feel if it was only French. How many objections would there be?

The CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

Mr. WINCH: I would listen to the simultaneous translation.

Mr. THOMAS (*Middlesex West*): Mr. Chairman, I can sympathize with Mr. Caron's point of view on this matter which has been raised in Parliament for a long time. It has been one of the problems of Parliament, and one of the principles for which our Canadian citizens from Quebec feel very strongly. I am prepared to back Mr. Caron in this request. I would hope that Mr. Caron on this occasion would give way and allow the committee to carry on but if he is not prepared to do that I think his point is well taken, and I am prepared to back it.

Mr. McNULTY: Mr. Chairman, I would ask Mr. Caron to concede on this occasion. I sympathize with him completely. I would hope that we could agree that in the future we do not hear any witnesses or have any briefs unless they are in both languages. The reason I ask Mr. Caron to concede on this occasion is that at the last meeting we did not have a quorum and this is the first occasion we have been able to hear witnesses. There is a possibility that the representative lawyer, Mr. Gorman, has overlooked this in trying to get this matter before the committee because is more or less an emergency situation and, as Mr. Churchill has pointed out, it is very necessary for western Canada. I would ask Mr. Caron just on this occasion to concede and in the future we will insist that all briefs and anything that comes before us would be in the two official languages.

(Translation)

Mr. GUAY: I am thinking about what Mr. Churchill has just said that it was just a technicality but it is more than a technicality for us, I think, and not only for Quebec people, but as Mr. Thomas who supported Mr. Caron, stated the same thing is always repeated every time we come to a Committee or that there is a brief, there is always a delay in the translation and the briefs are never submitted in both languages. I noticed it myself, in proposing an amendment in the House of Commons last week. I was listening to a speech on multi-culturalism. When there are speeches everyone applauds, but when we ask something concrete it is not the same thing and many of our members in the House are asking something concrete, and I think that once and for all, we should have legislation and we should vote on the amendment which is before the House so that there should be definite legal provision to recognize that we are a bilingual country, and this is not just a technicality. I do not agree with this, it is more than that and it is a principle which must be recognized once and for all. Mr. Caron might consider overlooking the question of privilege for today. It is not a question of words but it is a question of facts, we must consider facts.

Mr. BOULANGER: I would not hesitate either, since Mr. Caron—

The CHAIRMAN: One moment, please. If you would like to—

Mr. BOULANGER: Will you please ask Mr. Caron to save time, I was hoping to convince Mr. Caron to be tolerant for this time, but I hope you all understand, you who speak English, that we have problems in Quebec because of all these little things, silly things. A company such as the Canadian Pacific



presents us a brief in English, two or three newspaper men get hold of this and we are disqualified and discredited in our Province because of this. I agree with Mr. Caron in principle but I would like Mr. Caron in order to save time to forget great principles for a few minutes and to agree like Mr. Guay, to proceed anyway, but I sympathize with you and I agree with you and I would like you to change your mind by forgetting your question of privilege so that we can proceed.

(English)

Mr. MACDONALD (*Prince*): Mr. Chairman, I think there is one point we are overlooking. I have not had a great experience with committees but it is my understanding that because we recognize the bilingual aspect of the country when organizations come before any of our committees we require them to make their submission only in their own particular language and I do not think we have ever made it mandatory that an outside group coming before a committee must of themselves submit a document in both languages. What we do require is that when these documents are tabled or printed in our proceedings that they do appear in both languages. But I do not think it is right or tradition that we require those who come before our committees outside of government, as the representative of the CPR does here today, to present us with a copy in both languages. He has done so in his own language at this point and I think this is all that we have any right to require by the tradition in which these committees operate.

Mr. WINCH: Mr. Chairman, if I can have a seconder I would move that there now being a quorum we proceed with the business of the committee.

Mr. CARON: I do not accept that.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Winch, I feel this is a matter which it might be good to voice now. I would just like to say that I have Mr. Loisel who would like to say a few words and then if you would like to say a few words I am prepared to rule or suggest after.

Mr. WINCH: In view of the discussion, after you hear the others, I would like you to call upon me, if I can get a seconder, to move that we proceed, having a quorum, with the business of our committee.

Mr. LOISELLE: Mr. Chairman I will not be too long because I notice time is running out. In principle I support the objection of Mr. Caron and in the future every company or individual who comes to a committee especially when they are late with a petition should at least have their petitions printed in both languages. If it was some other company or some religious group, say, in B.C. or something like that, maybe I would accept it. The CPR operates all through Canada and their petitions and bills should be in French and English. In the future I will refuse to deal with or discuss bills in this committee unless they are in French and English; but today I would agree to go ahead; I will sacrifice my principles for today. I want to ask the Clerk of the committee if Mr. Caron is right when he says we have no right to sit unless the material is in French and English. If we have no right to sit it is useless to keep us here to discuss this matter.

The CHAIRMAN: I feel I could rule on that right away. I believe that we do have the right to sit. I would like to suggest that we have had numerous discussions on this.

Mr. WINCH: May I ask Mr. Caron if he will second my motion—

Mr. CARON: I will not second it.

Mr. WINCH: —that we now proceed with the business.

The CHAIRMAN: Just one moment please. I am sorry, but I am going to have to ask for order, gentlemen; it is getting a little out of hand. I would like to thank you all for your comments and in passing I would like to suggest that the other petitioners today, the Société des Artisans, last week when we could not form a quorum, came here with a copy in French only and it was their own suggestion to furnish one in English today. This was not requested by the committee. I might also suggest that this might have been an error on my part as I was under the impression that the CPR was going to bring their brief forward in French as well as in English. I did not look into and, therefore, I accept part of the blame for that. I would like to put forward to Mr. Caron that perhaps the committee could voice its opinion in suggesting that in future no petition will be considered by this committee unless it is presented both in French and in English—perhaps not the actual petition but any related papers, briefs or notes that could be put forward in French as well as in English, and then leave it up to us to decide whether it is the petitioner itself or the committee staff to translate it from English to French or French to English. This would permit us to carry on today but in future we would make sure that the briefs or notes put forward will be in both languages?

(Translation)

Mr. CARON: I cannot accept this point of view because the Committees must go according to the rules of the House and in the House if we do not have the bill in the two languages, it cannot be presented in the House. The Committee works according to the same principle as the House. We do not have the brief in the two languages therefore we cannot consider it and you have not the right to decide that we have the right to decide that we have the right to hear it, because it is not in the two languages. Therefore, it is my opinion that we should proceed to the bill on the Artisans and wait until the other brief is prepared in both languages.

(English)

Mr. MACDONALD (Prince): Mr. Chairman, it strikes me that Mr. Caron made one fundamental mistake in comparing the work of the committee with the work of the House. The documents that come before the House are the property and are put forward by members of the House, while this particular document comes not from any member of the House but from an agency outside the House and I do not think there is any mandatory requirement, as I stated earlier, for outside institutions or entities to submit their documents in both languages. Therefore, I think we are perfectly correct—unfortunate, but correct in assuming that we can begin with the work that is before us here.

Mr. WINCH: I so move.

The CHAIRMAN: Before accepting this, Mr. Guay has just brought to my attention the possibility that Mr. Caron—

(Translation)

Mr. Caron, if you do not mind, Mr. Guay has just told me—Mr. Guay can say so himself—

Mr. GUAY: I suggest that we should go on immediately to the Société des Artisans which will take about fifteen or twenty minutes, and I think that the representative of the CPR here, will take about ten minutes to have these twenty lines translated here at the Committee or elsewhere. It would take about a week to have it translated by some office or other. We should have an official copy to submit to the Committee.

● (2.00 p.m.)

(English)

Mr. LOISELLE: Oh excuse me. I just talked to Mr. Gorman a few minutes ago and he told me—now he has no time because we sit at 2.30 in the House of Commons—he is ready to make a French translation right after the sitting, if we hear his bill now, and he can have a French translation made out and send a copy to each member of the committee.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Mr. Chairman, there is only sentence here which is operative that is the fact that the CPR wants to build a 16½ mile line in Didsbury, Alberta. That is all it is. No wonder the Liberal party has no representation from Alberta. Here is a blocking move to prevent us getting development out in western Canada.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

Mr. CARON: Why is it always western Canada some member—

The CHAIRMAN: Order, order, order.

Mr. CHURCHILL: You bet your life and you have to recognize western Canada.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Mr. WINCH: It is part of Canada, not the whole.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, please, gentlemen may we have order, please. Order, please.

(Translation)

Mr. Boulanger, I want to say that I do not accept what Mr. Churchill has just said, specially his last remark, but I think that if Mr. Gorman—

(English)

Mr. CHURCHILL: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order it is not a question of whether you accept my remarks or not. It is not your privilege to say whether you accept them or not. Anybody here can make a statement. You do not have to give a judgment on it.

The CHAIRMAN: I was referring—



Mr. BOULANGER: You are just playing politics anyway; that is what you just said anyhow. You just mention Liberal party and you just play politics.

The CHAIRMAN: I was referring to the portion of Alberta and the—

Mr. CHURCHILL: Well if this committee wants to block the development of western Canada just go right ahead.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen.

Mr. WINCH: Why should the Quebec members, who are all bilingual, be blocking us from going ahead now.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Guay wants to know if his motion is accepted, that we go ahead with the Société of Artisans and then allow Mr. Gorman the opportunity of translating his short statement.

Mr. WINCH: Put the question, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Your question is, Mr. Winch?

Mr. WINCH: I understand there is a motion now that we proceed.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, that we now proceed with the business of the day. Mr. Guay has suggested we proceed with La Société des Artisans first instead of the CPR and then allow Mr. Gorman to translate his brief.

Mr. WINCH: For god's sake, why. Every member here from Quebec knows what this is. Why are they obstructing us.

Mr. CARON: Well, I will tell you. Since before Confederation we always had trouble all over Canada, even in Quebec. Go to Montreal and you see those of Westmount and Mont Royal, English Canadians who were born there. They did not take the trouble to learn French over there. You find the same thing in Quebec. In the city of Quebec they do not even go to the trouble to learn French. It is because they do not give a darn for French. I think it is time that this should stop; it has been like this since 1759. It has always been a complete repetition of the same thing and that is why I am protesting today and I am protesting for good.

Mr. WINCH: Mr. Chairman, if I can get a seconder I move that we proceed with the orders of the committee, starting with the CPR. I so move. Have I a seconder.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I second the motion.

Moved by Mr. Winch, seconded by Mr. Churchill, that we now proceed with the orders before the committee starting with the CPR.

(Translation)

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Guay.

Mr. GUAY: I would propose an amendment to the motion of Mr. Winch, I propose that Mr. Gorman would go and make a translation and we should proceed with the Société des Artisans. I think Mr. Winch must be in agreement with this.

(English)

Mr. MACDONALD (Prince): Mr. Chairman, with regard to that amendment, it seems to me we are in danger of setting a precedent which I do not think any

of us would want to do. We accept the fact that citizens of this country have the right and hopefully have the privilege to speak both or either French or English wherever they may live. But, I do not think we accept the fact that we force anyone to be bilingual and it seems to me if we are going to set precedent here of requiring independent groups that come before our committee to submit to us themselves their submissions in both languages this is in effect what we are saying, that we are going to require people who come before us to be bilingual and I do not think that is part and parcel of our Canadian heritage or purpose.

(Translation)

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Guay.

Mr. GUAY: I think there was a *lapsus linguae* on the part of the person who has just spoken; we are asking a Canadian corporation, the CPR, to express itself in both languages and to present its amendment in both languages. I do not think we asked Mr. Gorman to speak French, we are not asking anyone from Quebec or Alberta to speak either French or English. This is a bilingual country and that is all we want recognized before the Committee today.

(English)

The CHAIRMAN: May I bring to the attention of the committee—

Mr. WINCH: Sir, I think I know something about procedure. I call the previous question.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Winch—

Mr. WINCH: I call the previous question.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, may I just read to you Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Form, 4th edition under petition, chapter 10, section 333 which says:

Petitions may be written or typewritten or printed and may be in French or English.

They may be in French or in English. I also sympathize with Mr. Caron and those who have spoken in that way. What we are trying to do right now gentlemen, especially as this is the first time I have chaired this committee, I would hope we could get on with the committee, either by allowing Mr. Gorman the opportunity to translate his notes and proceedings immediately with La Société des Artisans or proceeding with the CPR as such and allowing Mr. Gorman to send us immediately after or as soon as he can a copy of this in French and so stating that as long as I am chairman of this committee I will make sure no petition will be brought before this committee unless it is in both languages, even if I have to translate it myself.

Mr. WINCH: Mr. Chairman, after 33 years I think I know procedures. I call for the previous question, which means put the motion now before us.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think, Mr. Winch, there is any such thing in committees as calling the previous question.

Mr. WINCH: Will you put the motion then, sir.

The CHAIRMAN: I have a motion and an amendment.

Mr. CARON: Put the amendment first.

Mr. WINCH: The amendment is out of order because it is contrary to the original motion.

Mr. CHURCHILL: It is just the opposite.

The CHAIRMAN: I would ask the indulgence of the committee again to reconsider what I just stated. I wonder if the persons that have put forward motions and amendments would be willing to withdraw their motions and amendments so that we could proceed with the committee under the notes that I have just stated.

Mr. WINCH: I prefer to withdraw my motion if you will proceed with the business of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN: If we will proceed with the business of the committee as such?

Mr. WINCH: Yes sir.

The CHAIRMAN: With the understanding that Mr. Gorman will furnish us as soon as possible with a French translation of the notes he has put forward. Is this acceptable to you, Mr. Winch?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Agreed.

The CHAIRMAN: Then we will proceed gentlemen, and Mr. Gorman would you like to comment please on your petition.

Mr. Gregory GORMAN (*Parliamentary Agent for Canadian Pacific Railway Company*): Yes, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. The purpose of the bill is to grant authority to the Canadian Pacific Railway to build a branch line to serve a plant at the Canadian Superior Oil Company Limited which is going to be producing sulphur from raw gas in the vicinity of Didsbury, Alberta. It is of course necessary to come to Parliament for this authority because the branch line, being 16 miles long, is greater than the 6 miles permitted without Parliamentary authority. The delay in bringing the bill before Parliament is occasioned by the negotiations which were in progress between the railway and the company and they were not concluded until the time limit for filing petitions had expired. The petition was filed some considerable time ago and the bill has now received third reading in the Senate, and would be ready to go before the House if your committee approves the receiving of the petition. You might say that it is a matter of considerable urgency that the line be built because there is need of the line to serve this new industry there; of course, we are into the good building season now and the hope is it will be passed by Parliament in time for the line to be built this summer. The danger is, I think, that if it goes beyond the summer recess of the House the bill would not be passed in time to allow it to be built before next year, which would create a great hardship, particularly, for the company that is being served by it.

Mr. WINCH: Sir, if I can get a seconder, I would move that this bill, S-34, be allowed to proceed and recommended to the House of Commons with full assessment of fines being placed against the C.P.R. for late filing.

Mr. CARON: A full assessment?

Mr. WINCH: Yes, for late filing, and that it be allowed to proceed.

Mr. CARON: But they should be charged.



Mr. WINCH: Assessed the full charge for late filing. If I can get a seconder I will so move.

Mr. CARON: I second the motion.

The CHAIRMAN: It has been moved by Mr. Winch, seconded by Mr. Caron, that the standing order No. 93 be suspended in relation to this petition and that the petition be received with the consequent charge of \$300. being levied.

Mr. CARON: How much?

The CHAIRMAN: It is \$300.

Mr. WINCH: The full sum, whatever it is.

The CHAIRMAN: It is \$300.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. BOULANGER: I would like to say it is a funny coincidence. I think like Mr. Caron, that some steps should be taken against you for some bad reasoning, especially through Mr. Churchill. You have to be extremely careful. You just watch this and then—

The CHAIRMAN: Order. All right. Order, please. That was unanimous.

Now, gentlemen we will proceed with the second petition in front of us which is a petition by La Société des Artisans.

An hon. MEMBER: Are there copies of this?

An hon. MEMBER: I want a copy in English.

The CHAIRMAN: You have one in English.

An hon. MEMBER: They are out.

Mr. BOULANGER: Give one to Mr. Churchill in French. Mr. Churchill wants a French one.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Perhaps Mr. Parent could ask his colleagues. . . Mr. Parent, will you please come forward, Mr. Parent?

Mr. Luc PARENT Q.C., (*Parliamentary Agent for La Société des Artisans*): Mr. Chairman, gentlemen. Can I speak only on this question? Just a few words, I am not going to read my own brief. In a few words, this is a fraternal society which holds annual meeting every four years and a general meeting at every four years and because of this meeting, it has formed a committee to draft rules and regulations at the end of last year. This committee has reported at the middle of March, when the delay for the petition has already expired. In this report, the committee has recommended certain amendments to the rules which require changes in the charter and it was already too late to produce the petition, but at any rate the General Council of the Society recommended that a petition be made up as soon as the superintendent in charge has approved the bill in principle, the bill was submitted to the Superintendent of Insurance and to the Committee of Standing Orders. As soon as the Senate Committee had approved, the petition was brought here, and that is why it is late in being presented in the House of Commons, but the reason for which it would be most important for the Société des Artisans that the bill should be heard during this session, is that if it is not approved, most of the amendments proposed to the charter for September will only be added in four years.

I, therefore, ask for these reasons, that the petition be received and if possible as it is a benevolent society that it should be the fine provided by the rules and regulations should be remitted.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Parent. Mr. Guay had also asked before—

Mr. GUAY: I would like to ask the witness the following question. In the proposed amendment, did you provide that meetings be held every year instead of every four years?

Mr. PARENT: This will not be in the amendments to the charter, but as a matter of fact, the Society has decided that in future, as we are entitled to do so, the meetings will be held every year.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Caron, I would like to keep some order. Mr. Winch.

(English)

Mr. WINCH: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask, is this a benevolent insurance society?

Mr. PARENT: It is a fraternal benefit society.

Mr. WINCH: You only have a general meeting every four years?

Mr. PARENT: We are obliged to have a general meeting of the members society every only once every four years.

Mr. WINCH: I do not see anything in your presentation to us to show a change in your by-laws.

Mr. PARENT: Well, in the exposé there are quite a few details about that.

Mr. WINCH: Will that be part of the bill?

Mr. PARENT: No. Some of the changes we are projecting for the by-laws could not be made unless the charter is changed.

Mr. WINCH: Well I think it is rather important, Mr. Parent. In the bill are we going to have some idea of the change you are going to make. For example, are you going to meet as an insurance company for a general meeting once a year and not once in four years.

Mr. PARENT: We do not intend to change that. As a matter of fact we have the privilege to hold a general meeting every year if we wish to have it but the elections and the amendments to the by-laws take place at a quadrennial meeting which takes place only every four years.

Mr. WINCH: I have one other question. Do you have to file with the committee the statement of the superintendent of insurance that he agrees with this? It has been the usual procedure on insurance bills that either the superintendent of insurance appears before us, Mr. Chairman, or he files a statement as, I think, the Clerk will tell you, that he has agreed to the proposed bill.

Mr. PARENT: He has agreed in fact.

The CHAIRMAN: It is on the bill I believe, Mr. Winch.

Mr. WINCH: Well, we have not the bill, sir. Has it been filed with you as Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: No, no. I believe it is before the finance committee.

Mr. PARENT: But I can, as a witness, assure you that the text has been revised with the superintendent of insurance and that it is going to be printed probably today or tomorrow after a lengthy study of the bill with the superintendent of insurance.

*(Translation)*

Mr. CARON: Mr. Winch has asked if it was a benevolent society. It is not a benevolent society, it is a mutual society, but not a benevolent society?

Mr. PARENT: It is a benevolent society, it is a mutual society, it is not a mutual society, it is a fraternal society, a fraternal benefit society?

Mr. CARON: It is not a benevolent society, is it?

Mr. PARENT: Yes, it is one of its aims to become a benevolent society.

Mr. CARON: Yes, you have been saying that for many years. It is a mutual insurance society.

Mr. PARENT: I would not like to be too technical, but there is a difference between a mutual society and a fraternal society before the law.

*(English)*

Mr. BIGG: Is it like the Civil Service Insurance Society, they all put their money into it together and divide the profits or something like that?

Mr. PARENT: No. The great difference is that we have the elections and there is representation. The democratic system is not the same as in the Civil Service Society; for instance, they have no power of attorney; with regard to the elections, there are what we call in French "locales", cells, which elect their regional congress who, in turn, elect delegates to the quadrennial meeting of the members, and it is these delegates who elect the directors of the society. But very important matters are decided by the general meeting of the members who are chosen by the regional congresses and, as I said before, these congresses are elected by the "locales", by the cells.

Mr. WINCH: Just one more question, Mr. Chairman. You only meet once every four years?

Mr. PARENT: Well, now—

Mr. WINCH: I am sorry, but what I want to know is this. You meet only once every four years. You have four years to consider changes. So, why is it when you require a change in the law of Canada for your association that, after four years, you are late in presenting your petition?

Mr. PARENT: Well the reason is that when the committee was formed to study the revision of by-laws of the society nobody thought that it would be necessary to amend the by-laws and it is this committee which was studying the changes to the by-laws for the society which came to the conclusion that some of these changes could not be made unless the charter was changed. At that time it was already too late to file a petition according to your rule.

Mr. WINCH: Well, Mr. Chairman, I sympathize but at the same time—and I have the honour of being a member of this committee for 13 years now—there is one thing that this committee does not like, and that is late filing. If I could have a seconder, Mr. Chairman, I would move that this bill be—



The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Winch, if I may interrupt you for a minute. Two other members have indicated they would like to speak before you do so. If you will permit me I would like to call on Mr. Carter.

Mr. CARTER: I would like the witness to give the committee some idea of what type of insurance you deal with. Is it just life insurance or other forms of insurance?

Mr. PARENT: It is only life insurance.

Mr. LOISELLE: Mr. Chairman, just one question. In answer to Mr. Guay did you say that in the future you intend to sit every year? I did not hear the answer?

Mr. PARENT: Well, in fact we do sit every year but these meetings do not have the power to amend the by-laws and to make elections. Only once every four years is the meeting empowered to change the by-laws of the society and make elections.

Mr. LOISELLE: But you do not intend to change that to annually?

Mr. PARENT: We still hold meetings annually but not for the purpose of elections or changes in by-laws because one of the amendments we are proposing will affect the elections. According to the charter, as it is right now, members of the executive committee can only be chosen from directors who reside in the city of Montreal and this we are going to change before the convention if possible because we want to have some members of the executive committee from outside of Montreal.

*(Translation)*

Mr. CARON: Your changes have been submitted to the Superintendent of Insurance?

Mr. PARENT: Yes.

Mr. CARON: And the Superintendent of Insurance, after studying this carefully, has given you the right to make changes. Now, was there anything to prevent you from presenting your bill at the House of Commons at the same time you presented it at the Senate?

Mr. PARENT: Here, I must say—

Mr. CARON: These are two different bodies. Even, in the House of Commons, when we speak of the Senate, we say “the other place”.

Mr. PARENT: I may say that we have, first of all, asked for the approval of the Superintendent of Insurance so we would not present a petition for nothing, but it is probably because of my lack of experience, it is the first time I present a bill here, I thought that the bill had to be presented at the Senate or at the House of Commons before—

Mr. CARON: Presented to both?

Mr. PARENT: Yes.

Mr. CARON: But nothing prevented you from submitting it to the House of Commons at the same time? And this would have prevented you from being subject to a fine.

Mr. PARENT: No, we were late at the Senate also.

Mr. CARON: Why?

Mr. PARENT: I had also to appear before the standing Committee on Standing Orders of the Senate.

Mr. BOULANGER: The questions asked by Mr. Caron are the same as my own, but I would like to—

(English)

I would like you English speaking people to understand that in Quebec this society is a big insurance company today and is highly regarded in Quebec. This is not just one of these fly by night operations. This is something which Quebec holds in very high regard as a life insurance group and at the beginning it was as you call it La Société des Artisans. I do not want you to be too hard on them and if there is a motion made to levy a fine of \$300 I will object to it.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen may I bring to your attention that it is now 2.25 and we have five minutes more to go.

Mr. WINCH: If you would allow me to put my motion sir?

The CHAIRMAN: If you would just allow Mr. Thomas two minutes before you do so, Mr. Winch.

Mr. THOMAS: Mr. Chairman, so far as I am concerned I have heard no reason yet given why—except for the last speaker—this fine should be forgiven this particular company. What I wanted to ask is this. Is this a public company? That is, can anyone buy insurance in this concern or is this a private organization in which only members of the organization themselves can—

Mr. PARENT: You have to become a member before taking the insurance.

Mr. CARON: Are you not a member once you buy insurance?

Mr. PARENT: You become a member by buying—

Mr. CARON: By buying insurance.

Mr. THOMAS: Can you be a member of the organization without buying insurance?

Mr. BOULANGER: No.

Mr. THOMAS: What is the basis of the organization. What does this word “artisans” mean? Are these carpenters, bricklayers or what?

Mr. PARENT: Originally, many years ago it was, but it is not any more.

Mr. THOMAS: Now it is anyone who wishes to buy insurance.

Mr. PARENT: Outside of insurance, it has some social functions, the main one of which is to make some loans to the students in every part of the province of Quebec, and in Ontario too.

Mr. THOMAS: Well, there is a certain benevolence connected with this. On those grounds I think we could forgive them that.

Mr. WINCH: I would like to say, sir, I see a number of members of this committee now who were members over the years. It will be remembered that two years this committee started bringing down the axe because we were getting too many of those so we insisted that it had to be brought to a halt;

even under benevolent circumstances we had to bring it to a halt. Therefore, sir, If I could get a seconder I would move that this petition be allowed to proceed but we maintain our previous stand and impose a nominal fine of \$100 for late filing.

Mr. BOULANGER: I second the motion.

The CHAIRMAN: It has been moved by Mr. Winch, seconded by Mr. Boulanger that a nominal fine of \$100 be applied to La Société des Artisans for late filing.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I would like to add a word. I do not understand the need for this fine, Mr. Winch. What is the purpose of this fine? Is it to prevent a flood of these petitioners coming here late?

Mr. WINCH: I do not want to go into it because time is late but I have been on this committee now for 13 years and we found year after year—speak to our Clerk—that every time we were getting “forgive me”, “a lawyer’s mistake”, “I did not know” and so on. So, two years ago the committee said we will because of circumstances let them pass, but you are going to be told that this should not happen, and sometimes a full fine was levied and, sometimes, a nominal fine. In view of this I request a nominal fine.

The CHAIRMAN: It has been moved by Mr. Winch, seconded by Mr. Boulanger, that a nominal fine of \$100 be applied to La Société des Artisans.

Motion agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: I believe that is all. Thank you gentlemen.

The committee adjourned.

---

THURSDAY June 30, 1966.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, we now have a quorum.

Following our last meeting many members of the Committee requested that this Committee’s proceedings be printed. If this is the wish of the other members of the Committee, it will be necessary to adopt a motion along the following lines—moved by somebody, seconded by somebody else, the number of copies that would be required. The normal printing is 750 copies in English and 300 copies in French. Is it the wish of the Committee to do so? This will include all meetings we have had up until today and including today.

It is moved by Mr. Caron, seconded by Mr. MacDonald, that the Committee print 750 copies in English and 300 copies in French of the Minutes of proceedings and Evidence of this Committee, of all meetings up to and including today.

All in favour? Objections?

Motion agreed to.

We have before us today for consideration one late petition; that is a petition which was filed in the House of Commons after the six-week period at the beginning of the session as provided under Standing Order No. 93. We must



decide to recommend to the House whether Standing Order No. 93 should be suspended in relation to his petition in order that it may be received.

I would like to introduce Mr. Bud Sherman M.P. who will give an explanation of why this petition was filed late.

Mr. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Gentlemen, the original incorporators of this petition went to Senator Campbell Haig in Winnipeg a year ago to start the procedure to incorporate and set up the Baptist General Conference in Canada. Since that time, however, a number of their officers have changed. It is a charitable organization and as a consequence the intention of those connected with this petition had to be made known and made plain to all those in the baptistries across Canada and the general memberships and officers of the Baptist Church, and this was a procedure which took some considerable time; as a matter of fact, it has taken the better part of the last year. As I say, the original initiator of the petition were changed in quite considerable dimension as a result of the normal process of turnover and change in the officers of the church itself, and this is the reason why the petition comes before you late, as it does.

Mr. LOISELLE: You just said a while ago that this conference is a charitable conference. In the bill do you propose to bring up some ways of revenue or making money?

Mr. SHERMAN: No, no. I used the term "charitable" in the sense that there are no economic ramifications at all.

Mr. MONGRAIN: Is there any urgency for passing this petition? Could it not wait until the next session?

Mr. SHERMAN: Well, the urgency, sir, is that it is the desire and in the interest of the people who constitute and will be embraced by the Baptist General Conference to have the conference incorporated as quickly as possible. It is designed to promote the general welfare and wellbeing of their organization and, as I said, we have already run into problems as a result of change of officers, which is a circumstance that is unavoidable in a church organization. I can foresee similar difficulties arising and similar changes and, as a consequence, it would appear to be in the best interests of those who are interested in incorporating this conference to have it acted upon now or as soon as possible.

Mr. CARON: Is it possible that these officers may change each year?

Mr. SHERMAN: It is possible, yes.

Mr. CARON: So you are not bringing it up here by reason of a change in officers?

Mr. SHERMAN: I did not get the significance of your question.

Mr. CARON: You will not bring it up here each year?

Mr. SHERMAN: No, no.

Mr. CARON: So it is not on account of a change in officers. There is another reason for bringing it up.

Mr. SHERMAN: Well except that—

Mr. CARON: The change of officers has nothing to do with it?

Mr. PETERS: Mr. Chairman, can I ask a question to clarify the matter? Is the decision to incorporate as the Baptist General Conference of Canada not a decision of lesser body that now wants to be constituted under this name? The decision was taken by a general meeting of the major organization of Baptists, or was really was made by the membership and not by the officers. The officers are only names on the application, is this not true?

Mr. SHERMAN: That is correct.

Well, Mr. Chairman, as I said, it is in the interests of the general membership to have it incorporated as soon as possible because the conference is designed to promote the welfare of the organization.

Mr. CARON: Well, you spoke of a change of officers, and I do not think this has anything to do with it.

Mr. SHERMAN: Well, I did not mean to confuse the issue.

Mr. MONGRAIN: Who are the petitioners in this case? Are they the authorized officials of this Baptist organization, or are they outsiders?

Mr. SHERMAN: No, they are not outsiders. I have the names of the petitioners on the actual petition itself.

Mr. MONGRAIN: Do you happen to know if they have any official responsibility in this Baptist religion—I will call it religion because I am trying to find a word for it—or are they authorized by the authorities of this Canadian Baptist religion to present a petition such as this to Parliament?

Mr. SHERMAN: Yes, they are so authorized. However, I think by naming them or by identifying them by name, would not mean anything to members of the Committee.

Mr. CARON: There is no fight about the facts between different groups?

Mr. SHERMAN: No, sir.

Mr. CARON: They all think alike.

Mr. PETERS: Would it be better for the sponsor to table the motion which asks for the establishment of the Baptist General Conference of Canada?

Mr. SHERMAN: The actual petition itself?

Mr. PETERS: No, the motion, if there is one. This would overcome the discussion with respect to the names. I am referring to the authority to set it up; that is the motion that any company would have to have before they could be chartered.

Mr. BALDWIN: My point is not quite on the same line, but I wonder if Mr. Sherman could say if there is a world Baptist organization, and that one of the purposes of it would be to give a distinctly Canadian aspect to a body incorporated in Canada subject to Canadian laws, and it would be if so incorporated. Would this be correct?

Mr. SHERMAN: It might be, Mr. Baldwin, but I would not assume the responsibility for assuring the Committee of the fact; I do not know. I was going to say in answer to Mr. Caron a moment ago, when he asked me whether all Baptists spoke with the same voice, I am not a Baptist myself and I can

assure you that the membership in my church certainly do not speak with a cohesive voice, so I should not leap to such assumptions or conclusions about the Baptists either.

(Translation)

The CHAIRMAN: Just a moment. Mr. Duquet has indicated that he wishes to put a question. It will be your turn after that. Mr. Duquet?

(English)

Mr. DUQUET: I notice people such as Mr. Klink, Mr. McLloyd, and Mr. Sparks appearing on the petition; one is in Saskatchewan, one is in Manitoba, and the other one is in Ontario. Are those people recognized as heads of the Baptist Church in Canada, or under this petition would they be recognized as heads of the Baptist Church in Canada? I will put my question in another way: We have Baptist Churches in the province of Quebec and in Quebec city; if we recognize the Baptist General Conference of Canada, would that mean that this conference would have authority over all Baptist congregations in Canada wherever they are or whichever province they are in?

Mr. SHERMAN: Not to my knowledge, sir.

Mr. DUQUET: Well, what would happen to the other Baptists, for instance, in the province of Quebec, if there is to be a Baptist General Conference of Canada?

Mr. SHERMAN: They would be free to join it if they wanted to; but this conference would have no legal or judicial authority; it is a promotional body.

Mr. DUQUET: Well, Article A of the petition says to promote, maintain, superintend and carry on in accordance with the constitution, acts and rules of the corporation any or all of the work of that body. To superintend, in my opinion, means it will give them full authority, and that is what I am worried about. What about the other provinces where there are Baptist Churches, where do they come in?

Mr. MACDONALD (Prince): Mr. Chairman, may I offer a word of explanation?

The CHAIRMAN: May I suggest to you, Mr. MacDonald, that this is just a petition to allow this to come forward. All explanations will be put into the bill at the time, and will be presented to the Miscellaneous Private Bills. I think at that time we will have all the information in the bill which we require, but now we are discussing the reason why this petition is late and was brought to our Committee for consideration.

Mr. DUQUET: At the same time, Mr. Chairman, this petition is to incorporate the Baptist General Conference of Canada.

(Translation)

The CHAIRMAN: It is not the bill at all Mr. Duquet. This is just a petition requesting leave to introduce a bill.

Mr. DUQUET: O.K.

The CHAIRMAN: Then it would be rather for that reason.

(English)

Mr. DUQUET: There is a motion I would like to put.



The CHAIRMAN: Before you put your motion, I think Mr. MacDonald suggested he wanted to say something.

Mr. MACDONALD: (*Prince*): Well, I was just going to offer a word of explanation. I think it is only fair to say that the very nature of the Baptist Church is such that each congregation is autonomous in its own right, and when groups of Baptist churches or representatives of Baptist churches set up an organization they do so without in any way impeding the freedom of any of the individual Baptist congregations. This is the nature of the Baptist denomination today.

Mr. SHERMAN: The Baptists of Quebec could join the general conference if they wished to, but they would not have to; there is no element of compulsion about it.

Mr. DUQUET: They can operate without joining it; they cannot be forced to join?

Mr. SHERMAN: No, an unequivocal no.

Mr. LOISELLE I move that the Baptist General Conference of Canada be allowed to present their bill in the House of Commons without any fines or charges.

Mr. McNULTY: I second the motion.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. SHERMAN: I would like to take this opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to thank you and the members of the Committee for your hospitality, your kindness and your consideration in this respect.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Sherman, for your kind presentation.

Since there is no more business before the Committee, we will adjourn until the call of the Chair.



OFFICIAL REPORT OF MINUTES  
OF  
PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

This edition contains the English deliberations  
and/or a translation into English of the French.

Copies and complete sets are available to the  
public by subscription to the Queen's Printer.  
Cost varies according to Committees.

LÉON-J. RAYMOND,  
*The Clerk of the House.*



HOUSE OF COMMONS

First Session—Twenty-seventh Parliament

1966

---

STANDING COMMITTEE

ON

**STANDING ORDERS**

*Chairman:* Mr. PATRICK T. ASSELIN

---

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 2

---

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 20, 1966

---

Respecting the Petition

of

The Bell Telephone Company of Canada

---

WITNESSES:

*Representing The Bell Telephone Company of Canada:* Mr. Gregory Gorman, Parliamentary Agent; and Mr. A. J. de Grandpré, Vice-President of the Company.

ROGER DUHAMEL, F.R.S.C.

OTTAWA, 1966

QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY

## STANDING COMMITTEE ON STANDING ORDERS

*Chairman:* Mr. Patrick T. Asselin

*Vice-Chairman:* Mr. James McNulty

and

Mr. Baldwin  
Mr. Bigg  
Mr. Boulanger  
Mr. Brown  
Mr. Churchill  
Mr. Coates  
Mr. Duquet  
Mr. Éthier

Mr. Groos  
Mr. Guay  
Mr. Gundlock  
Mr. Habel  
Mr. Horner (*Jasper-  
Edson*)  
Mr. Johnston

Mr. Laniel  
Mr. LeBlanc (*Rimouski*)  
Mr. Loiselle  
Mr. MacDonald (*Prince*)  
Mr. Mongrain  
Mr. Peters  
Mr. Thomas (*Middlesex  
West*)—23.

E. W. Innes,  
*Clerk of the Committee.*

## ORDERS OF REFERENCE

Tuesday, October 18, 1966.

*Ordered*,—That the petition of Bell Telephone Company of Canada, to amend its Act of Incorporation, filed after the time limit specified in Standing Order 93, be referred to the Standing Committee on Standing Orders, together with the Seventeenth Report of the Clerk of Petitions thereon presented to the House on Monday, October 17, 1966, for any recommendations the Committee deems advisable.

WEDNESDAY, October 19, 1966.

*Ordered*,—That the names of Messrs. Habel and Laniel be substituted for those of Messrs. Caron and Carter on the Standing Committee on Standing Orders.

Attest.

LÉON-J. RAYMOND,  
*The Clerk of the House of Commons.*



## REPORT TO THE HOUSE

FRIDAY, October 21, 1966.

The Standing Committee on Standing Orders has the honour to present its

### THIRD REPORT

Pursuant to its Order of Reference of October 18, 1966, your Committee has considered the following petition for a Private Bill, filed after the time specified in Standing Order 93, together with the Clerk of Petitions' report thereon tabled on October 17, 1966.

#### The Bell Telephone Company of Canada

The spokesmen for the Company stated that it is essential that the proposed legislation be allowed to proceed as soon as possible during the present session of Parliament. They asked that the petition be received.

---

Having considered the petition for a Private Bill, your Committee recommends that Standing Order 93 be suspended, in relation thereto, and that the petition be received. The consequent charges as provided by Standing Order 94 (3) (a) and (c) will amount to \$300.00

The petition referred to above, together with the report of the Clerk of Petitions related thereto, is returned herewith.

A copy of the relevant Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issue No. 2*) is appended.

Respectfully submitted,

PATRICK T. ASSELIN,  
*Chairman.*

NOTE: Report concurred in Oct. 25, 1966.

## MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

Thursday, October 20, 1966.

(4)

The Standing Committee on Standing Orders met at 1.40 p.m. this day, the Chairman, Mr. Patrick T. Asselin presiding.

*Members present:* Messrs. Asselin (*Richmond-Wolfe*), Churchill, Coates, Éthier, Groos, Habel, Johnston, LeBlanc (*Rimouski*), Laniel, McNulty, Mongrain, Peters, Thomas (*Middlesex-West*) (13).

*Also present:* Mr. Langlois (*Mégantic*), M.P.

*In attendance:* Mr. Russel Honey, M.P., Sponsor of the petition concerned; and *representing the Bell Telephone Company of Canada:* Mr. Gregory J. Gorman, Parliamentary Agent, Mr. A. J. de Grandpré, Vice-President; and Mr. J. P. Gagnon, Assistant Vice-President.

The Committee proceeded to its Order of the Day as follows:

*Petition of the Bell Telephone Company of Canada* (filed October, 14.)

The Parliamentary Agent, Mr. Gorman, explained that it is essential that the proposed legislation be allowed to proceed as soon as possible during the present session of Parliament.

The Vice-President outlined the purposes of the proposed legislation and the expansion of the services that are being envisaged by the company. The company's spokesman asked that the petition be received and the proposed legislation be permitted to proceed.

On motion by Mr. Mongrain, seconded by Mr. Laniel,

*Resolved unanimously:*—That a recommendation be made to the House that Standing Order 93 be suspended in relation to this petition, and the petition be received with the consequent charges of \$300.00 being levied.

The Chairman was instructed to report to the House accordingly.

At 2.15 p.m. the Committee adjourned to the call of the Chair.

E. W. Innes,  
*Clerk of the Committee.*





## EVIDENCE

(Recorded by electronic apparatus)

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, I see we have a quorum.

We have before us today for consideration one late petition; that is a petition that was filed in the House of Commons after the six-weeks period at the beginning of the session as provided under Standing Order 93. We must decide to recommend to the House whether Standing Order 93 should be suspended in relation to this petition in order that it may be received. The suspension of this Standing Order will automatically levy a charge of \$300 on the petitioner. It is possible for us to recommend a lesser charge or to waive all charges, but that is for the Committee to decide.

We have with us Mr. Gregory Gorman, who is the Parliamentary Agent on behalf of the petitioner, The Bell Telephone Company of Canada. He will outline the purpose of the petition and the reason for its late filing. We also have with us Mr. A. J. de Grandpré, Vice President and General Counsel of the Company and Mr. J. P. Gagnon, the Assistant Vice President of Public Affairs of the Bell Telephone Company.

I will now call on Mr. Gorman.

Mr. GREGORY GORMAN (*Parliamentary Agent*): Mr. Chairman and hon. members, the company regrets the delay in filing this petition. The reasons for the delay are set out in the memorandum which I believe has been circulated to all members in English and in French. I think all I can really say is that it is a matter of considerable importance to the company that the petition and the bill be considered by the house at the earliest possible opportunity. It is our wish to proceed if possible at the present session of parliament.

The bill itself is quite a lengthy one; its purpose is to make certain amendments to the company's act of incorporation. I do not know whether the committee would wish to go into the details of it at this meeting, but Mr. de Grandpré and Mr. Gagnon are here to answer any questions that members might wish to put to them.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Gorman. May I suggest that it is not for us to go into the actual bill, because the bill has not been printed. Our purpose here is to discuss the lateness in the presentation of this petition. Has anyone any questions that they would like to address either to Mr. Gorman, Mr. de Grandpré or Mr. Gagnon?

● (1.45 p.m.)

(*Translation*)

Mr. MONGRAIN: Mr. Chairman, if you would allow me, I have a question for Mr. de Grandpré. You say that maybe it is not the appropriate moment to know

the nature of the amendments. What is the nature of the amendments you want brought to the bill incorporating the company, so we can establish whether it is an urgent matter?

Mr. de GRANDPRÉ: With your permission I would like to indicate as briefly as possible what amendments we want to bring into the bill.

First of all, we want to increase the capital of the company which is now \$1 billion, we want to increase it to \$1,750 million. We also intend to request authority to create privileged stocks, it is not that we intend as soon as we have this power to issue privileged stocks, but it is essential in the present market conditions to have as much flexibility available to us as possible. In the financial structure of the company, we have been told that there would be an advantage in having privileged stocks to offer. There is a possibility of creating privileged stocks in regard to public services. For instance within the financial structure of the Quebec Telephone, there is privileged stock, B.C. Telephone also has privileged stocks and it is solely with a view to obtaining greater flexibility in handling financial matters that we are requesting this permission.

We also want to include in our incorporation bill the definition of the word "telecommunication" which is already in the Criminal Code, it has been realized that it is difficult at the moment to operate a telephone company which is only a telephone company without at the same time having powers extending into the field of telecommunications. So true is it that when the last general revision of the Criminal Code took place an amendment was made to the general provision regarding wire-tapping in order to relate it henceforth to theft of communications. It is a normal development in the thinking of legislators. The telephone is no longer the telephone as conceived in 1880, but we must keep up-to-date with technological developments, that is why we want to extend our powers, in the bill, to telecommunications.

We have a number of other amendments to bring so as to enable us, to create a corporation that would be in the field of research, applied research and pure research, as well as in telecommunication, both to protect Canada against any possibility of the drying-up of sources of supply of research that have been largely in the United States and if, one day, this research source from the United States were closed to us, Canada would be in a difficult position in trying to keep up a Northern-American telecommunication system.

I believe that is the major purposes. There are other amendments of details, such as an executive committee, the right of the company to make loans to its employees who are in need, even if the employees are stockholders of the company, the power to create insurance plans for employees when the employees are transferred from one place to another, I mean assistance in the field of housing. The employees are often transferred in areas where there are no housing facilities, sometimes they are sent to areas where the housing facilities are very expensive and in certain circumstances the region is less prosperous at a certain moment, then the employee who has invested in housing and who is to be sent to another area because the company no longer needs as many employees in that area, is caught with a substantial investment within the area, so the company would like to help its employees in providing for some type of housing assistance.

(English)

The CHAIRMAN: Would anybody else like to ask a question?

Mr. MONGRAIN: I would like to ask a question of Mr. Gorman. Having in mind those staggering figures of \$300 million and \$350 million, I suppose you will not insist on a reduction of the penalty that normally would be \$300 for being late?

Mr. GORMAN: That is for the Committee to decide. These will be no submission by the petitioner at this time.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions which you would like to pose?

● (1.55 p.m.)

(Translation)

Mr. MONGRAIN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to put another question. Do you feel you can convince the members of the Committee that if this were brought up at the next session instead of this one you would be in serious difficulty.

Mr. de GRANDPRÉ: Yes, in the course of the last few years in particular, the capitalization expenses of the company in meeting service requirements and modernization of equipment, both in urban and rural areas, were so heavy that we had an explosion when we appeared last year before your Transport and Communications Committee for consideration of the profit standards of the company. We have made some estimates as to the annual construction programme and the figure, which was as fair as possible that we could foresee, was in the order of \$250,000,000 a year for some years to come. Now, this year, the construction costs, capitalization costs, are in the order of \$330,000,000, and next year, we expect they will be still in the same class, and in 1968 probably the figure will be closer to \$350,000,000 or \$360,000,000. Truly, to finance this programme we absolutely must have facilities to issue supplementary stocks because this year, in view of the money market, we had to get \$145,000,000 borrowed capital. This has resulted in raising the percentage of the company's debt from 40 per cent eighteen months ago to 43½ per cent. Our debt load is 43½ per cent instead of 40 per cent, and the administrators of the company feel that due to the nature of our operations, it is difficult to continually increase the debt percentage load carried by the company; financing by shares would be more expensive. We would be in danger of losing—we would lose the rating we have. We would lose the rating of our stock on the United States market which is good now. If we increase our debt, it is quite possible that we would have to face the loss of our stock rating. Loss of this rating would have two consequences. First of all, it would cost the company a great deal more to finance its operations, and secondly, we might equally lose our loan sources because the number of lenders who are governed in the United States by rigid standards with regard to the stocks and shares in which they can invest, and there are a good many funds in the United States, as you are aware, which are prevented from investing in lower quality stock than others.

Mr. LANIEL: Mr. Chairman, a minute ago Mr. de Grandpré spoke of capitalization. When you speak of capitalization, do you mean the expansion of your field of activity? Are you purchasing other companies?



Mr. de GRANDPRÉ: In the programme of construction that I referred to a minute ago, \$335,000,000 to \$350,000,000 a year does not include the acquiring of other companies. This \$350,000,000 a year only means the expansion of our own territory to serve areas not served by ourselves or inadequately served by ourselves, and it equally covers the modernization of the equipment already used, and it covers equally expenditures which are so-called—to keep up the service, in English, the stand-still expenses. These are expenditures that are being incurred in the expanding of routes. It does not give us more subscribers, it does not give us more facilities. They are capital expenditures we must make at certain times. They are a mixed sort of expenses. When we replace old equipment, we attempt to replace it with much better and more up-to-date equipment, but this does not *ipso facto* increase the revenues of the company.

Mr. LANIEL: I know that if my information is correct, you acquired a telephone company in the Timmins area not so long ago.

Mr. de GRANDPRÉ: Yes, we did. The "Northern Company".

Mr. LANIEL: There were some complaints from people in regard to an immediate increase in rates without an improvement in service. I wonder whether the Committee could discuss this. Perhaps the Committee does not have the right, but I wonder whether your capitalization covers improvement of that service, and I want to know whether you intend to get funds to buy other services.

Mr. de GRANDPRÉ: Yes, it is clear that part of our capitalization—I do not speak of our annual capital expenditures—but part of the additional capitalization will be used to acquire other companies that are not in our territory.

Mr. LANIEL: I have a question for you, Mr. Chairman. As I am a new member of the Committee, are similar petitions submitted regularly by companies requesting amendments late? What has been the policy of the Committee in regard to late submissions? Is it a case. . .

The CHAIRMAN: It is fairly frequent. That is one of the reasons for the setting up of this Committee. The Committee was formed to look into why petitions were submitted late, and not to examine the basis of the bill.

Mr. LANGLOIS (*Mégantic*): What do you mean by late submission of a petition?

The CHAIRMAN: Under Standing Order 93, there is a certain delay—if someone submits a petition or a notice of petition some days after the specified time in Standing Orders, then we have a right to impose a penalty.

Mr. LANGLOIS (*Mégantic*): The Committee should know what the changes consist of, in view of the fact this is a change in the incorporation of the company. I followed what Mr. de Grandpré told us about the financing of the company. Now, is he changing the act of incorporation?

The CHAIRMAN: If you will allow me, first of all, the bill is not printed. Mr. Mongrain put the same question a few minutes ago at the opening of the sitting. You came a few minutes late but it was the first question put, and Mr. de Grandpré did outline to the satisfaction of the Committee what the changes are. If you do not mind, we will not repeat what has already been stated. We will simply take it as recorded. I think it is not up to us to discuss the content of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Other questions?

Mr. LANIEL: I assume that the Bell Telephone Company has the permission to submit data and it is up to the Committee to decide whether the Bell Telephone Company may submit the bill.

The CHAIRMAN: That is right. When it is submitted to the House, we will then discuss the bill itself.

(English)

I believe that when the bill is introduced and receives second reading it will be referred to the Transport Committee and it will be handled there. But our question here is whether we accept the late petition and recommend to the House the suspension of Standing Order 93.

Mr. MONGRAIN: I so move.

Mr. LANIEL: I second the motion

The CHAIRMAN: With the \$300 fine?

Mr. MONGRAIN: Is that the normal fee?

The CHAIRMAN: Normal fee.

Mr. PETERS: Could I just ask the Parliamentary Agent if he is in a position to indicate whether or not the shareholders have approved of the application before us?

Mr. GORMAN: The directors have.

Mr. PETERS: No, the shareholders, as required by law. Are you in a position to assure us that this has been done.

Mr. de GRANDPRÉ: The shareholders have not, Mr. Peters, passed any resolution authorizing the board to file this petition before parliament. This has never been done in the past. It was the opinion of the law department that it was not necessary to submit this petition to the shareholders of the company because none of the rights of the shareholders are modified. Without going into the provisions of the bill, if I may, Mr. Chairman, indicate to Mr. Peters, that there is a provision in the bill whereby preferred shares might be created, and if preferred shares are created, of course, there is a provision that this matter will be referred to the shareholders. But as far as the bill itself is concerned, it is felt that this is a matter of management which is entrusted to the directors of the company and is not a matter which should be referred to the shareholders.

Mr. PETERS: I am not objecting to what is in the bill or any of the terms of the bill, but the fact is that a parliamentary agent appearing before us must be sure, and I understand that the practise is that he must give the assurance or be in a position to give the assurance that this is the wish of the shareholders of the organization coming before us and a resolution should be presented in this regard. This is a question I am asking of the parliamentary agent rather than of the company. This is not their responsibility. I understand that it is the agent's responsibility.

Mr. GORMAN: Mr. Chairman, I know that in the past in connection with certain charitable bodies, which were not share capital corporations, that that sort of assurance has been given; but this I submit is a somewhat different case,

and the legal opinion that we have is that the rights of the shareholders as such are not being affected by the bill, so that I would think that the other rule, if it exists, would not be applicable to a case such as this.

The CHAIRMAN: I would also like to suggest, Mr. Peters, that the shareholders might have the opportunity to voice their opinion when the bill receives second reading and it is sent to the Transport committee.

Mr. PETERS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like to pursue it and have the Chairman get legal opinion for the Committee on this matter, because I think that it is important from the point of view of the function of parliamentary agents; otherwise they serve no purpose, if they are not able to give the Committee assurance that this is in the interests of the people, whom they represent. In this case I think the shareholders are—

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think, Mr. Peters, that we are here to defend the rights or the wrongs of the shareholders. Our job here is to study the reasons why they presented a petition late and to my knowledge I do not think that it is for us to discuss.

Mr. MONGRAIN: Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to Mr. Peters' argument,—

● (2.05 p.m.)

(Translation)

Mr. LANIEL: I assume that the Bell Telephone has the permission—

The CHAIRMAN: Has the permission to present?

Mr. LANIEL: That it is up to the Committee to decide whether the Bell Telephone Company meets the requirements or not.

The CHAIRMAN: That is right. We will submit it to the House and we will then discuss the bill itself.

Mr. MONGRAIN: On condition they pay the penalty.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, I believe that when the bill—

(English)

Mr. MONGRAIN: —I think this is not our responsibility. It will be the responsibility of the committee later. We are only here to decide whether they can be excused from following the standing orders, that is all.

The CHAIRMAN: That is my interpretation of the rules of this committee.

Mr. LANIEL: What I was about to say, Mr. Chairman, is that actually we are here to decide if whether or not permission should be granted to Bell Telephone not to abide by Standing Order No. 93, and give them permission to present their petition. If that petition had been presented on time, this Committee would not have had to sit. The normal procedure will follow after we report to the house and the bill will be sent to a committee where the people concerned will have a chance to present their case.

The CHAIRMAN: That is right; I agree with that.

Mr. PETERS: There is no objection, Mr. Chairman; it is just that there is no point in being represented by a parliamentary agent, unless this assurance can be given. It was in this regard that I raised the question.



The CHAIRMAN: Yes, I will put the motion moved by Mr. Mongrain and seconded by Mr. Laniel.

All those in favour?

Any opposed?

Motion agreed to.

Thank you very much, gentlemen. There is no other business before us. We will report accordingly. The Committee will now adjourn to the call of the Chair.







OFFICIAL REPORT OF MINUTES  
OF  
PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

This edition contains the English deliberations  
and/or a translation into English of the French.

Copies and complete sets are available to the  
public by subscription to the Queen's Printer.  
Cost varies according to Committees.

LÉON-J. RAYMOND,  
*The Clerk of the House.*





